

VIRGINIA CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II

for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



**PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005
PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce “red tape” and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21st Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by January 31, 2005. Part II is due to the Department by April 15, 2005.

PART I

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **January 31, 2005**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

PART II

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2003-2004 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2003-2004 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **January 31, 2005**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2003-2004 school year, unless otherwise noted. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities).

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to conreport@ed.gov, or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield
U.S. Department of Education
Room 3E307
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 182 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E231, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

VIRGINIA CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I

For reporting on
School Year 2003-2004



PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005

OMB Number: 1810-0614
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:

Commonwealth of Virginia

Address:

Virginia Department of Education
Office of Program Administration and Accountability
P.O. Box 2120
Richmond, VA 23218-2120

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Ms. Roberta Schlicher, Director, Office of Program Administration and Accountability

Telephone: (804) 225-2870

Fax: (804) 371-7347

e-mail: roberta.schlicher@doe.virginia.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Signature

January 31, 2005
Date

I. STANDARDS and ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

A. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).

STATE RESPONSE

The Virginia Science Standards of Learning (SOL) were originally developed and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in June 1995. Following the schedule established by the Board of Education for revision of all content standards, the science standards were revised in 2003 to reflect updated information related to science as well as input from the field. In addition to the Standards, a companion curriculum framework document has also been developed that provides detailed guidance for school divisions in implementation of the Science Standards of Learning. Both documents are available on the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml>

Student performance on the Science Standards of Learning is assessed through a statewide criterion-referenced, multiple choice assessment directly linked to the Standards. Students are assessed once in third, fifth, and eighth grades as well as at the end of the high school science courses in Earth Science, Biology, and Chemistry. The third, fifth, and eighth grade assessments are cumulative.

B. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.

STATE RESPONSE

Virginia currently administers reading, mathematics, and science tests in third, fifth, and eighth grades. End-of-course tests in these subject areas are administered at the high school level after completion of the corresponding content course. Additionally, new reading and mathematics tests for fourth, sixth, and seventh grades are being field tested with full implementation scheduled for 2005-2006. Local school divisions are involved in the development of the assessments through content review committees in each subject area. Selected teachers, principals, and curriculum specialists representing all regions of the state meet annually to assist the test publisher and the state assessment office in development of each test item in each subject area.

An alternate assessment program that measures alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities has been in place in Virginia since the 2001-2002 school year. An alternate assessment program that measures grade-level achievement standards for students with disabilities is currently being developed and will be implemented in the 2004-2005 school year.

C. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

STATE RESPONSE

The Virginia Board of Education has adopted challenging academic achievement standards called the Standards of Learning as the basis of a comprehensive reform effort begun in 1995. The Standards of Learning for reading/language arts, mathematics, and science can be accessed via the Virginia Department of Education's Web site at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml>.

The Standards of Learning set forth minimum content standards for students in kindergarten through eighth grade as well as for high school level courses. The Standards of Learning set reasonable targets and expectations for what students should know and be able to do at each grade level or within each high school course.

The Board of Education has approved a seven-year schedule of evaluation and revision for all Standards of Learning. The Mathematics Standards of Learning were most recently revised in 2001. The Standards of Learning for Reading/Language Arts were revised in 2002. The Science Standards of Learning were revised in 2003.

Additionally, a curriculum framework as well as an enhanced scope and sequence document have also been developed for the reading/language arts, mathematics, and science standards. These documents provide detailed guidance for school divisions in implementation of the standards. The documents are available on the Department of Education Web site at:

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/home.shtml>

Virginia has alternate achievement standards in place for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. The standards were developed by standard-setting committees through established state procedures and approved by the Virginia Board of Education in October 2001.

II. PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS

A. Participation of All Students in 2003-2004 State Assessments

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-2004 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Student Participation in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	506,456	98.48
American Indian/Alaska Native	1,617 ⁽¹⁾	98.36
Asian/Pacific Islander	26,710 ⁽¹⁾	99.17
Black, non-Hispanic	124,785 ⁽¹⁾	97.65
Hispanic	29,923 ⁽¹⁾	98.20
White, non-Hispanic	315,172 ⁽¹⁾	98.81
Students with Disabilities	58,089	96.89
Limited English Proficient	26,141	98.37
Economically Disadvantaged	121,361	97.94
Migrant	250	108.23 ⁽²⁾
Male	253,012 ⁽³⁾	98.31
Female	253,015 ⁽³⁾	98.66

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students Tested	Percent of Students Tested
All Students	354,651	99.16
American Indian/ Alaska Native	1,126 ⁽¹⁾	98.34
Asian/ Pacific Islander	17,280 ⁽¹⁾	100.60 ⁽²⁾
Black, non-Hispanic	92,478 ⁽¹⁾	98.32
Hispanic	22,322 ⁽¹⁾	102.53 ⁽²⁾
White, non-Hispanic	216,432 ⁽¹⁾	99.08
Students with Disabilities	47,680	96.69
Limited English Proficient	20,369	105.00 ⁽²⁾
Economically Disadvantaged	96,327	98.18
Migrant	165	78.95
Male	179,815 ⁽³⁾	98.98
Female	174,604 ⁽³⁾	99.33

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

- ⁽¹⁾ Racial totals do not equal all students total, as the racial category was not specified on some student answer documents.
- ⁽²⁾ Percentages exceed 100 due to demographic information discrepancies coded on student test answer documents.
- ⁽³⁾ Male and female totals do not equal the all students total, as the gender category was not specified on some student test answer documents.

B. Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	54,057	93.06
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4,032	6.49

2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment	Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested	Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	43,648	91.54
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards	N/A	N/A
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	4,032	8.46

III. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2003-2004 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2003-2004 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2003-2004 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Grade 3 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	87.23
American Indian/Alaska Native	85.55
Asian/Pacific Islander	94.62
Black, non-Hispanic	76.74
Hispanic	83.85
White, non-Hispanic	91.67
Students with Disabilities	74.38
Limited English Proficient	84.02
Economically Disadvantaged	78.67
Migrant	78.08
Male	87.20
Female	87.29

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	71.47
American Indian/Alaska Native	71.10
Asian/Pacific Islander	80.54
Black, non-Hispanic	56.30
Hispanic	61.79
White, non-Hispanic	78.56
Students with Disabilities	47.23
Limited English Proficient	60.08
Economically Disadvantaged	56.71
Migrant	70.00
Male	67.63
Female	75.53

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 4 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 4 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

*Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning tests at grade 4.

Grade 5 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	78.26
American Indian/Alaska Native	81.03
Asian/Pacific Islander	89.50
Black, non-Hispanic	65.50
Hispanic	68.73
White, non-Hispanic	84.25
Students with Disabilities	51.50
Limited English Proficient	67.40
Economically Disadvantaged	65.53
Migrant	66.67
Male	76.93
Female	79.69

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 5 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	84.51
American Indian/Alaska Native	85.14
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.35
Black, non-Hispanic	74.30
Hispanic	78.78
White, non-Hispanic	89.26
Students with Disabilities	61.74
Limited English Proficient	77.81
Economically Disadvantaged	73.71
Migrant	78.05
Male	81.49
Female	87.73

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 6 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

*Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning tests at grade 6.

Grade 7 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 7 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	*
American Indian/Alaska Native	*
Asian/Pacific Islander	*
Black, non-Hispanic	*
Hispanic	*
White, non-Hispanic	*
Students with Disabilities	*
Limited English Proficient	*
Economically Disadvantaged	*
Migrant	*
Male	*
Female	*

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

*Virginia does not currently administer the Standards of Learning tests at grade 7.

Grade 8 Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	79.95
American Indian/Alaska Native	73.13
Asian/Pacific Islander	93.06
Black, non-Hispanic	66.66
Hispanic	73.17
White, non-Hispanic	85.39
Students with Disabilities	45.08
Limited English Proficient	69.56
Economically Disadvantaged	66.88
Migrant	59.09
Male	77.65
Female	82.41

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	72.10
American Indian/Alaska Native	67.67
Asian/Pacific Islander	82.55
Black, non-Hispanic	55.95
Hispanic	59.49
White, non-Hispanic	79.45
Students with Disabilities	36.49
Limited English Proficient	50.26
Economically Disadvantaged	54.34
Migrant	48.15
Male	68.36
Female	75.97

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

High School Mathematics	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	83.68
American Indian/Alaska Native	81.99
Asian/Pacific Islander	91.39
Black, non-Hispanic	71.38
Hispanic	75.69
White, non-Hispanic	87.96
Students with Disabilities	58.97
Limited English Proficient	77.57
Economically Disadvantaged	74.51
Migrant	64.81
Male	83.31
Female	84.06

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

High School Reading/Language Arts	Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04
All Students	89.49
American Indian/Alaska Native	87.39
Asian/Pacific Islander	92.09
Black, non-Hispanic	80.34
Hispanic	82.82
White, non-Hispanic	93.18
Students with Disabilities	67.98
Limited English Proficient	74.81
Economically Disadvantaged	79.55
Migrant	58.82
Male	88.00
Female	90.92

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

IV. SCHOOL and DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY

A. For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

School Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	1,826	1,345	73.66

District Accountability	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State	Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP	Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	132	30	22.72

B. For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

Title I School Accountability	Total number of Title I schools in State	Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	767	586	76.40

Title I District Accountability	Total number of Title I districts in State	Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP	Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	132	30	22.72

C. Title I Schools Identified for Improvement

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2004-2005 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year, please mark "Made AYP 2003-2004."

2. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

The Virginia Department of Education provides technical assistance to schools identified for improvement or corrective action through a school-level academic review process that has been designed to provide schools considered in the greatest need with the most assistance. Schools in greatest need are those that have failed to meet both adequate yearly progress (AYP) targets as well as state accreditation requirements. These schools receive the most direct technical assistance from the state.

The school-level academic review process is the primary vehicle for helping schools identify and analyze instructional and organizational factors affecting student achievement. The focus of the review process is on the systems, processes, and practices that are being implemented at the school and division levels. Specifically, information is gathered that relates to the following areas:

- Alignment of the local curriculum with state learning standards
- Use of time and school scheduling practices
- Use of data to make instructional and planning decisions
- Professional development opportunities provided for staff
- School improvement planning
- Implementation of an instructional method or model/program for schools previously warned in English or mathematics
- Organizational systems and processes
- School culture

Within each of these areas, indicators reflecting effective practices have been identified. These indicators are based on state laws and Virginia Board of Education regulations as well as on research-based practices found to be effective in improving student achievement. The on-site review team collects and analyzes data that provide evidence regarding the school's progress in implementing these practices. As a result of the

team's review, a follow-up report is given to the school and division with recommended essential actions that can be used to develop, revise, and implement the school's three-year school improvement plan which is required by the Board of Education. Follow-up technical assistance in implementing the essential actions is also provided.

A detailed description of the school-level academic review process and related technical assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Education can be found at <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Accountability/accreditation.htm>.

In addition to the process outlined above, which serves as the foundation for the delivery of technical assistance to schools in improvement status, the Virginia Department of Education provides technical assistance under six broad categories. These categories are listed below with representative technical assistance examples.

- Standards and Instructional Resources
 - Standards of Learning (SOL) Curriculum Frameworks/Enhanced Scope and Sequence/Pacing Guides
 - SOL Instructional Modules/LEP and Special Education Differentiation Strategies
- Assessment and Data-Driven Decision Making
 - SOL Assessments
 - Electronic Practice Assessment Tools
 - Benchmark Assessments
- Instructional Support, Interventions, and Acceleration
 - Project Graduation
 - The Governor's PASS (Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools) Initiative
 - Virginia Preschool Initiative
 - Turnaround Specialist Program
- Teacher Quality and Leadership Development
 - Guidelines for High Quality Professional Development
 - Teacher Recruitment in Hard-to-Staff Schools
 - Teacher Quality Enhancement
- Partnerships and Support Networks
 - Mathematics and Science Partnerships
 - School/University Partnerships
 - Professional Organization Partnerships
 - Regional Educational Laboratory
- Accountability and Results and Informed Parents
 - School Accreditation
 - Division Efficiency Reviews
 - Federal Program Monitoring
 - Report Cards

Targeted Technical Assistance for School Identified as Needing Corrective Action

Listed below are four targeted technical assistance approaches that are used, depending on the needs of the schools, for those schools identified for as needing corrective action.

Governor Mark Warner's Partnership for Achieving Successful Schools (PASS): This statewide initiative fosters intense community involvement with schools that are having the most difficulty reaching targeted levels of academic performance and specific Standards of Learning (SOL) goals. Through partnerships with the civic, educational, and business community surrounding each PASS school, students and their families receive focused assistance to help them boost SOL scores and otherwise improve their overall schooling experience.

The Virginia Department of Education's Turnaround Specialist Program: The University of Virginia Partnership for Leaders in Education, a partnership of the Darden Graduate School of Business Administration and the Curry School of Education (Darden/Curry Partnership) has been contracted to deliver an executive education program specially designed for the needs of a cadre of experts who are charged with "turning around" consistently low-performing schools in the commonwealth, such as in schools that are in corrective action. The program focuses on leadership challenges, strategic change, decision-making, communications, and partnering. It offers the opportunity for successful school administrators who have already earned at least a Master's Degree to also earn a professional credential in educational turnaround management.

Partnership with Regional Educational Laboratory: The Virginia Department of Education works in partnership with its regional educational laboratory, AEL, Inc., to provide highly specialized, on-site technical assistance to at least one of the state's school divisions that has had difficulty meeting the state's accreditation standards and meeting the NCLB adequate yearly progress measures. Each elementary school in the division, including schools that are in corrective action, receives a specially trained reading and mathematics specialist as an addition to the faculty. AEL provides ongoing staff development and monitoring to the schools.

Federal Program Monitoring: Selected school divisions receive federal program monitoring visits as an extension of the established Virginia Department of Education academic review process. Trained federal program monitors conduct on-site visits to review the use of Title I, Part A, and Title III, Part A, funds to improve teaching and learning in high poverty schools. Monitors are apprised of divisions that have schools in corrective action. Monitoring is more comprehensive in these school divisions.

Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring
As of January 18, 2005

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	School Name	NCES School No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
				Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Accomack County Public Schools	5100060	Accawmacke Elementary	1737	X						Year 1
Accomack County Public Schools	5100060	Metompink Elementary	1738			X				Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Jefferson-Houston Elementary	44	X		X				Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	John Adams Elementary	45	X	X		X			Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Maury Elementary	48	X						Year 2
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	Patrick Henry Elementary	52	X		X				Year 1
Amherst County Public Schools	5100210	Central Elementary *	68							Year 2
Appomattox County Public Schools	5100240	Appomattox Elementary	77	X						Year 1
Appomattox County Public Schools	5100240	Appomattox Primary	79	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Abingdon Elementary	81	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Barcroft Elementary	83	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Barrett Elementary	84	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Carlin Springs	93	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Hoffman-Boston Elementary	1900	X	X					Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	Randolph Elementary	13	X						Year 1
Augusta County Public Schools	5100300	Riverheads Elementary	128	X						Year 1
Brunswick County Public Schools	5100480	James S. Russell Junior High	182		X		X			Year 1
Brunswick County Public Schools	5100480	Sturgeon Elementary	187			X				Year 1
Buchanan County Public Schools	5100510	Council Elementary	1897			X		X		Year 1
Buchanan County Public Schools	5100510	Riverview Elementary/Middle	1950	X						Year 1
Buchanan County Public Schools	5100510	Twin Valley Elementary/Middle	1953			X				Year 1
Charles City County Public Schools	5100720	Charles City County Elementary	260			X				Year 1
Charlottesville City Public Schools	5100780	Clark Elementary	2110			X				Year 1

* School made AYP and will remain in the current School Improvement status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject matter.

** Corrective Action schools have also been classified as Year 3 schools in Virginia.

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	School Name	NCES School No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
				Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Danville City Public Schools	5101110	Glenwood Elementary	2113		X					Year 1
Dickenson County Public Schools	5101140	Sandlick Elementary	408	X						Year 1
Essex County Public Schools	5101200	Essex Intermediate	420	X						Year 1
Essex County Public Schools	5101200	Tappahannock Elementary	421	X						Year 1
Fairfax County Public Schools	5101260	Dogwood Elementary	458	X						Year 1
Fairfax County Public Schools	5101260	McNair Elementary	1959	X						Year 1
Halifax County Public Schools	5101770	Scottsburg Elementary	717			X				Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Cesar Tarrant Elementary	736	X		X				Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Francis Mallory Elementary	740	X						Year 1
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Hampton Harbour Academy	997	X						Year 2
Hampton City Public Schools	5101800	Jane H. Bryan Elementary	743	X		X	X			Year 1
Hanover County Public Schools	5101830	Henry Clay Elementary	770	X						Year 1
Hopewell City Public Schools	5101980	Patrick Copeland Elementary	870	X						Year 1
Isle of Wight County Public Schools	5102010	Smithfield Middle	874	X						Year 1
King George County Public Schools	5102100	King George Elementary	881	X		X				Year 1
King William County Public Schools	5102120	Acquinton Elementary	2151	X						Year 1
Lee County Public Schools	5102190	Pennington Middle **	900		X		X			Corrective Action
Louisa County Public Schools	5102280	Trevilians Elementary	2066	X						Year 1
Lunenburg County Public Schools	5102310	Victoria Elementary	949	X						Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools	5102340	Linkhorne Middle	962	X						Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools	5102340	Paul L. Dunbar Middle For Innovation	955	X	X		X			Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools	5102340	Perrymont Elementary	964	X		X				Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools	5102340	Sandusky Middle	967	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Martinsville City Public Schools	5102400	Albert Harris Intermediate	984	X		X	X			Year 1
Nelson County Public Schools	5102580	Tye River Elementary	1160	X						Year 1

* School made AYP and will remain in the current School Improvement status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject matter.

** Corrective Action schools have also been classified as Year 3 schools in Virginia.

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	School Name	NCES School No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
				Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	Briarfield Elementary	1042	X						Year 2
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	Hiddenwood Elementary	1051	X				X		Year 1
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	L. F. Palmer Elementary	1060	X				X		Year 1
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	Lee Hall Elementary	1061	X						Year 1
Norfolk City Public Schools	5102670	Dreamkeepers Academy at J.J. Roberts Elementary	1132		X					Year 1
Norfolk City Public Schools	5102670	James Monroe Elementary	2211	X						Year 1
Northampton County Public Schools	5102710	Occohannock Elementary	554	X						Year 1
Northumberland County Public Schools	5102730	Northumberland Elementary	1392	X						Year 1
Nottoway County Public Schools	5102790	Nottoway Intermediate	1165	X		X				Year 1
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	J. E. B. Stuart Elementary	1196	X		X				Year 2
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	Peabody Middle	1197			X				Year 2
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	Robert E. Lee Elementary **	1200	X						Corrective Action
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	Vernon Johns School **	653	X		X		X		Corrective Action
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	Westview Elementary	1204	X		X		X		Year 2
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Gretna Middle	1217	X				X		Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Kentuck Elementary	1220	X						Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	Southside Elementary	1224		X	X				Year 1
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	Hodges Manor Elementary *	1249							Year 2
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	James Hurst Elementary	1252	X		X				Year 1
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	Stephen H. Clarke Academy **	1251		X	X	X			Corrective Action
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	Westhaven Elementary	1264	X						Year 1
Prince Edward County Public Schools	5103060	Prince Edward Middle	2130	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Prince William County Public Schools	5103130	Marumscos Hills Elementary	1306	X						Year 1
Pulaski County Public Schools	5103150	Critzer Elementary	1330			X				Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Blackwell Elementary *	1357							Year 2

* School made AYP and will remain in the current School Improvement status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject matter.

** Corrective Action schools have also been classified as Year 3 schools in Virginia.

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	School Name	NCES School No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
				Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Chandler Middle **	654	X	X		X			Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Chimborazo Elementary *	1359							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Clark Springs Elementary *	1360							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Elkhardt Middle **	1364	X	X		X			Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Fairfield Court Elementary	1365							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Franklin Military Academy *	2214							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Fred D. Thompson Middle	1368		X		X			Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	G. H. Reid Elementary	1369	X	X	X		X		Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	George Mason Elementary **	1370		X		X			Corrective Action
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	George W. Carver Elementary	1862	X						Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Henderson Middle	1374		X					Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	J. L. Francis Elementary	1378	X		X				Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Lucille M. Brown Middle	1894	X			X			Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Martin Luther King Jr. Middle	1385		X					Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Maymont Elementary *	1865							Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Overby-Sheppard Elementary	1389		X		X			Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Patrick Henry Elementary	1391	X	X	X				Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Summer Hill/Ruffin Road	1401	X				X		Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Thomas C. Boushall Middle	2078		X		X			Year 2
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	Woodville Elementary **	1407		X		X			Corrective Action
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Addison Aerospace Magnet Middle	1412	X		X				Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Forest Park Magnet	1418	X		X				Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Garden City Elementary	1419	X		X				Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Hurt Park Elementary	1423	X		X				Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Lincoln Terrace Saturn Network	1425		X					Year 1

* School made AYP and will remain in the current School Improvement status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject matter.

** Corrective Action schools have also been classified as Year 3 schools in Virginia.

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	School Name	School No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
				Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Oakland Intermediate	2217		X					Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Preston Park Primary	1431		X					Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	Westside Elementary	1437	X						Year 1
Spotsylvania County Public Schools	5103640	Berkeley Elementary	1586	X						Year 1
Stafford County Public Schools	5103660	Rocky Run Elementary	2547	X		X		X		Year 1
Surry County Public Schools	5103750	Luther P. Jackson Middle	1201		X	X				Year 1
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	Annie B. Jackson Elementary	2136	X		X				Year 2
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	Ellen W. Chambliss Elementary	1640	X		X				Year 2
Tazewell County Public Schools	5103810	Raven Elementary	1659	X						Year 1
Warren County Public Schools	5103870	Warren County Middle	1734	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Westmoreland County Public Schools	5103980	Washington District Elementary	1769	X		X				Year 1
Winchester City Public Schools	5104050	Garland R. Quarles Elementary	1779	X						Year 1
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	Jackson Memorial Elementary	1799	X						Year 1

* School made AYP and will remain in the current School Improvement status until AYP is made two consecutive years in the same subject matter.

** Corrective Action schools are also classified as Year 3 schools in Virginia.

D. Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action).

2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The instructional technical assistance activities described under the school-level academic review process and the additional technical assistance activities that are listed in C2 are also implemented at the division level with minor modifications. The focus of the division-level improvement is to generate change at the school level by assisting in preparing effective school leaders. In addition, the department has designed, under the guidance and authority of the Board of Education, a division-level academic review process. Division-level academic reviews are conducted only in those school divisions that have been identified by the Board as those with the greatest need. The description of the division-level academic review process follows.

Teams of trained educators conduct initial visits, on-site reviews, and follow-up visits to identified divisions. During these visits, teams hold introductory meetings with local school boards, conduct interviews, review documents and self-studies, and observe operational practices. Additionally, the teams collect and analyze data, and use the data to prepare a series of reports. Among the specific types of activities and visits conducted are the following:

- Share analyses of findings of school-level academic reviews conducted in division
- Assign self-studies for completion prior to next visit
- Obtain signed agreements
- Hold introductory meeting with local school board to explain purpose and process, directed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, President of the Board of Education, and/or their designees
- Identify Virginia Standards of Quality (SOQ) focus for review
- Establish dates for on-site review
- Analyze documents and data
- Generate report of findings detailing areas of strength, areas of noncompliance with SOQ, essential actions and timeframes to be incorporated into corrective action plan
- Conduct follow-up visits

- Gather data to determine degree of implementation of essential actions designed to increase educational performance
- Monitor and enforce development and implementation of corrective action plan and process
- Federal Program Monitoring

School divisions develop corrective action plans for improving student achievement and correcting areas of noncompliance based upon the findings of the division-level academic review. This corrective action plan must be part of the divisions' six-year plan required by the SOQ, and must be approved by the local school division, and submitted to the Virginia Board of Education for approval within 30 business days of the on-site visit.

Findings from these reviews are reported quarterly to the Virginia Board of Education. Any school division not implementing essential actions; not correcting areas of noncompliance; or failing to develop, submit, and implement required plans and status reports is required to report its lack of action directly to the Virginia Board of Education.

Detailed information about the division-level academic review process and related technical assistance provided by the Virginia Department of Education can be found at: <http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Accountability/accreditation.htm>.

Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action
As of January 18, 2005

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Accomack County Public Schools	5100060	X	X		X			Year 1
Albemarle County Public Schools	5100090	X						Year 1
Alexandria City Public Schools	5100120	X						Year 1
Alleghany County Public Schools	5100152	X						Year 1
Amelia County Public Schools	5100180	X						Year 1
Appomattox County Public Schools	5100240	X						Year 1
Arlington County Public Schools	5100270	X						Year 1
Augusta County Public Schools	5100300	X		X				Year 1
Botetourt County Public Schools	5100420	X						Year 1
Bristol City Public Schools	5100450	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Brunswick County Public Schools	5100480	X			X			Year 1
Buchanan County Public Schools	5100510	X	X		X			Year 1
Buckingham County Public Schools	5100540	X	X		X			Year 1
Campbell County Public Schools	5100600	X		X				Year 1
Caroline County Public Schools	5100660	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Charlottesville City Public Schools	5100780	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Culpeper County Public Schools	5101050	X	X		X			Year 1
Cumberland County Public Schools	5101080	X	X	X				Year 1
Danville City Public Schools	5101110	X		X				Year 1
Dinwiddie County Public Schools	5101170	X		X				Year 1
Essex County Public Schools	5101200	X						Year 1
Falls Church City Public Schools	5101290		X					Year 1
Fauquier County Public Schools	5101320	X	X		X			Year 1
Floyd County Public Schools	5101350	X						Year 1
Frederick County Public Schools	5101470	X						Year 1
Fredericksbrg City Public Schools	5101510	X						Year 1

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Galax City Public Schools	5101560	X			X			Year 1
Greene County Public Schools	5101710	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Greensville County Public Schools	5101740	X		X	X			Year 1
Harrisonburg City Public Schools	5101860	X						Year 1
Henry County Public Schools	5101920	X	X		X			Year 1
King and Queen County Public Schools	5102070	X		X		X		Year 1
King George County Public Schools	5102100	X		X				Year 1
King William County Public Schools	5102120	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Lee County Public Schools	5102190		X		X			Year 1
Loudoun County Public Schools	5102250	X						Year 1
Louisa County Public Schools	5102280	X						Year 1
Lunenburg County Public Schools	5102310	X						Year 1
Lynchburg City Public Schools	5102340	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Madison County Public Schools	5102370	X						Year 1
Manassas City Public Schools	5102360	X						Year 1
Manassas Park City Public Schools	5102390	X						Year 1
Martinsville City Public Schools	5102400	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Mathews County Public Schools	5102430	X		X	X			Year 1
Mecklenburg County Public Schools	5102460	X		X				Year 1
Montgomery County Public Schools	5102520	X		X				Year 1
Nelson County Public Schools	5102580	X		X				Year 1
Newport News City Public Schools	5102640	X						Year 1
Norfolk City Public Schools	5102670	X		X				Year 1
Northampton County Public Schools	5102710	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Northumberland County Public Schools	5102730	X		X				Year 1
Nottoway County Public Schools	5102790	X						Year 1
Orange County Public Schools	5102820	X		X				Year 1
Patrick County Public Schools	5102880	X						Year 1

District Name (School Division)	NCES District No.	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Proficiency Target	Missed Participation Rate	Missed Attendance or Science (elementary/ middle schools)	Missed Graduation Rate (high school)	
Petersburg City Public Schools	5102910	X	X	X	X		X	Year 1
Pittsylvania County Public Schools	5102940	X						Year 1
Poquoson City Public Schools	5102980	X						Year 1
Portsmouth City Public Schools	5103000	X		X				Year 1
Prince Edward County Public Schools	5103060	X	X		X			Year 1
Pulaski County Public Schools	5103150	X						Year 1
Radford City Public Schools	5103180	X						Year 1
Rappahannock County Public Schools	5103210			X				Year 1
Richmond City Public Schools	5103240	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Roanoke City Public Schools	5103300	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Rockbridge County Public Schools	5103370	X	X		X			Year 1
Rockingham County Public Schools	5103390	X						Year 1
Russell County Public Schools	5103420	X						Year 1
Southampton County Public Schools	5103600	X			X			Year 1
Spotsylvania County Public Schools	5103640			X				Year 1
Stafford County Public Schools	5103660	X	X	X	X			Year 1
Suffolk City Public Schools	5103710	X						Year 1
Sussex County Public Schools	5103780	X			X			Year 1
Tazewell County Public Schools	5103810	X						Year 1
Va Beach City Public Schools	5103840	X						Year 1
Washington County Public Schools	5103900	X		X				Year 1
Waynesboro City Public Schools	5103930	X		X				Year 1
Williamsburg-James City Public Schools	5104020	X						Year 1
Winchester City Public Schools	5104050	X						Year 1
Wythe County Public Schools	5104110	X						Year 1
York County Public Schools	5104150	X		X				Year 1

E. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.

31

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 26 How many of these schools were charter schools?

0

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 432

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 19,030

Optional Information: If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 558 (See Note 1 below.)

2. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2003-2004 school year. 558
(See Note 2 below.)

2. Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 22

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I, during the 2003-2004 school year. 1,301

Notes

Note 1: Question is answered in terms of the number of parents that requested transfers.

Note 2: All parents were offered a choice option.

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year.
11,444

Optional Information: If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 1,301

V. TEACHER and PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY

A. Highly Qualified Teachers. NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

1. In the following table, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” and “low-poverty” schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and “low-poverty” schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	182,478	172,357	94.5
By Poverty Status			
High-Poverty Schools	25,423	23,434	92.2
Low-Poverty Schools	59,355	57,274	96.5
By Level			
Elementary	58,022	55,598	95.8
Secondary	124,556	116,759	93.8

2. Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty schools used in the table above.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
State Poverty Quartile Breaks	More than 53.58 percent	Less than 19.28 percent
Poverty Metric Used	Percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch	

3. Please provide the State’s definition of elementary and secondary school level as used in the chart above.

a. Elementary Level kindergarten through grade 6

b. Secondary Level grade 7 through grade 12

B. High-Quality Professional Development. In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

	Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development
2003-2004 School Year	99.3

C. Paraprofessional Quality. NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A, funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2003-2004 School Year	53.6

VI. English Language Proficiency

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards

Please provide an updated description of the State's progress since September 1, 2003, in developing and implementing ELP standards as required under section 3113(b)(2). Please describe the progress the State has made in linking the ELP standards to academic content in reading/language arts and mathematics. Provide a description of the State's progress in developing ELP standards that are linked to academic content in science. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**

STATE RESPONSE

English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards of Learning for limited English proficient (LEP) students were adopted by the Virginia Board of Education in November 2002. The standards contain four levels of English proficiency which are designated level 1, level 2, level 3, and level 4. The proficiency levels span across four grade clusters: kindergarten through second grade, third through fifth grade, sixth through eighth grade; and ninth through twelfth grade. Within each of the four proficiency levels, the standards further define the domains of oral language (listening and speaking), reading, and writing. These standards represent what LEP students should know and be able to do upon successful completion of each proficiency level.

The ELP Standards are linked to the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning which is demonstrated through their publication as an integrated section of the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning. The domain descriptors for both the Reading/Language Arts Standards of Learning and the ELP Standards are the same and serve as the linking strand between the two groups of Standards. The indicators that are listed beneath the descriptors differ between the two groups of standards. The difference in the indicators reflects the distinction between what native English speakers should know and be able to do in regard to grade level performance in Reading/Language Arts compared to what and LEP student should know and be able to do upon successful completion of each proficiency level. The ELP Standards can be accessed via the link below.

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/Superintendent/Sols/EnglishSOL02.html>

The linkage between the ELP Standards and the Mathematics Standards of Learning has been accomplished via a resource document entitled, "Mathematics: Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students – A Supplemental Resource to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence." The document serves as a supplement to the K-12 Mathematics Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence, which assists teachers with aligning their classroom

A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards (continued)

instruction with the Mathematics Standards of Learning. This document is intended to provide classroom teachers with effective strategies for differentiating instruction for LEP students. The document can be accessed via the link below.

<http://www.doe.virginia.gov/VDOE/EnhancedSandS/mathematics.shtml>

The linkage between the ELP Standards and the Science Standards of Learning will be accomplished through a similar resource document that will be entitled, "Science: Strategies for Teaching Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students – A Supplemental Resource to the K-12 Science Standards of Learning Enhanced Scope and Sequence. This document is scheduled to be completed by December 2005.

B. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments**1. Please describe how the State ensures:**

- The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12;
- The ELP assessment(s) address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension

2. If the State is using multiple ELP assessments, please describe how the State:

- Set technical criteria for the assessments (validity and reliability);
- Ensured the assessments are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
- Reviewed and approved each assessment; and
- Ensured that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels

3. Please provide an updated description, including a timeline, of the State's progress in developing and implementing new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency standards as required by section 3113(b)(2)(C)(iii).**STATE RESPONSE**

1. The state ensures that all local school divisions in the state annually administer an English language proficiency (ELP) assessment to all K-12 LEP students in the state in the following ways. The information is announced annually via Superintendents' memoranda that remind school divisions of the requirement. Follow-up Superintendents' memoranda are issued that describe regional trainings that are held regarding the administration of the ELP assessment. Additionally, Title III Coordinators and Division Directors of Testing (DDOTs) receive technical assistance through a series of academies in the fall and spring of each year. These academies, which are sponsored by the Virginia Department of Education, include formal presentations that address the assessment requirements for LEP students.
2. For the 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years, the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) assessment has been approved as the ELP assessment for use by school divisions. The SELP assessment contains subtests that address each of the required four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. A comprehension score is derived through combination of the listening and reading subtests.

C. English Language Proficiency Assessment Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2003-2004** school year test administration. English language proficiency data should include **all** students in the State who were assessed and identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments. The State must also disaggregate ELP data by number and percentage of students who participated in Title III programs.

The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level and should include the following:

1. Total number and percentage of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency (“assessed” refers to the number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments)
2. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) (“identified” refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments)
3. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s)
4. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year
5. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III
6. Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2003-2004 school year.

States may use the sample formats below or another format to report the requested information.

Table C-1: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 1, 2, and 3 on the previous page

2003-2004 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State												
Name of LEP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number or percentage of ALL students assessed (2)	Total number or percentage of ALL students identified as LEP (3)	Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency (ELP)									
			Number and Percentage at ELP Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 4 (7)		Exit (Includes Monitor Year 1, Monitor Year 2, and Exited)	
Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment	Number: 63,357*	Number: 60,308**	Number: 7,721	Percent: 12	Number: 12,343	Percent: 19	Number: 13,079	Percent: 21	Number: 11,316	Percent: 18	Number: 18,898	Percent: 30

*As of spring 2004 SELP administration.

**As of September 30, 2003 fall membership report.

Table C-2: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 4, 5, and 6 on the previous page

2003-2004 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State														
Name of LEP Assessment (s) (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency (ELP)									
					Number and Percentage at ELP Level 1 (4)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 2 (5)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 3 (6)		Number and Percentage at ELP Level 4 (7)		Exit (Includes Monitor Year 1, Monitor Year 2, and Exited)	
Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) Assessment	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:	Number:	Percent:
	62,353	98*	15,060	24**	7650	12	12,167	20	12,707	20	11,109	18	18,720	30*

*Percentage of identified LEP students served under Title III out of total LEP population served under Title III that participated in spring 2003-2004 SELP administration.

**Percentage of Title III LEP students served under Title III on first and second year monitor status out of total LEP population served under Title III that participated in spring 2003-2004 SELP administration.

D. Immigrant Children and Youth Data

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111(c).

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 1. Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-2004 | <u>21,440</u> |
| 2. Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2003-2004 | <u>20,220</u> |
| 3. Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children and youth programs for 2003-2004 | <u>38</u> |

E. Definition of Proficient

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "proficient" in English as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State's ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State's definition of "proficient" in English**
- **Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English**

STATE RESPONSE

The September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission for the state's definition of "proficient" has changed as follows.

The annual measurable achievement objectives for attaining English language proficiency are projections for LEP students at each grade cluster K-2, 3-5, 6-8, 9-12 who are to be reclassified as non-LEP after receiving direct language instruction for five consecutive years or less. Non-LEP students shall be defined as those students who maintain full proficiency in English by scoring at the proficient level on the reading and writing portions of the English language proficiency assessment for two consecutive years after formally exiting the language instruction program.

The test score range for each level as well as cut scores for each proficiency level have been determined by Harcourt Assessment, Inc. The detailed information regarding the cut scores for each proficiency level is outlined in the Harcourt Assessment, Inc. Technical Manual for the SELP.

The domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension, are weighted equally in the state's definition of proficient.

F. Definition of Making Progress

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State's definition of "making progress" in learning English in Title III served schools as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State's English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

STATE RESPONSE

The September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission for the state's definition of "making progress" has changed as follows.

The annual measurable achievement objectives for making progress are projections for LEP students who have been enrolled for a full academic year in a Virginia public school to increase one level or more on the English Language Proficiency Standards of Learning as measured by a body of evidence that includes the state-approved English language proficiency assessment results.

The ELP levels are defined as level 1, level 2, level 3, level 4, monitor year 1, and monitor year 2. The domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing are assessed to determine progress for each proficiency level. The description of these levels remains the same as was submitted in the September 1, 2003, submission.

G. Definition of Cohort

If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State’s definition of “cohort.” Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.

STATE RESPONSE

The September 1, 2003, Consolidated State Application submission for the definition of cohort has changed as follows.

The LEP cohort will be defined as all LEP students who have been enrolled in a Virginia public school for a full academic year.

H. Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

 X Yes No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information. If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency. and provide the data from that evaluation.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
2003-2004 School Year	20 percent	47 percent (29,778)	10 percent	20 percent (18,898)

I. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III.

***Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** The LEP cohort has been defined as all LEP students in the state that have been enrolled for a full academic year.

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent or Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English		Percent or Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency	
	Projected	Actual	Projected	Actual
2003-2004 School Year	20 percent	46 percent (28,682)	10 percent	20 percent (18,720)

J. Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2003-2004 School Year.

- Number of Title III subgrants 66
- Number of Title III subgrants that met Title III annual measurable achievement objectives 22
- Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives 44
- Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives Due to large increases in the number of LEP Immigrant students *Data not collected.

VII. Persistently Dangerous Schools

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2004-2005 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>

	Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools
2004-2005 School Year	0

VIII. Graduation and Dropout Rates

A. Graduation Rates

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2002-2003 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.

In response to the individual student-level reporting requirements in the legislation, Virginia began developing a longitudinal student database in summer 2004. During the 2004-2005 school year, unique state-wide identifiers will be assigned to all students with an expectation for all students to have a unique state-wide identifier by the beginning of the 2005-2006 school year. Longitudinal data will be available to calculate the graduation rate for all subgroups beginning with the graduating class of 2008-2009.

GRADUATION RATE

High School Graduates	Graduation Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	81.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	87.5
Asian/Pacific Islander	89.2
Black, non-Hispanic	75.2
Hispanic	72.2
White, non-Hispanic	84.4
Students with Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	N/A
Male	78.4
Female	85.4

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

B. Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

DROPOUT RATE

Dropouts	Dropout Rate
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	2.1
American Indian/Alaska Native	2.9
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.6
Black, non-Hispanic	3.3
Hispanic	4.8
White, non-Hispanic	1.5
Students with Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	N/A
Male	2.5
Female	1.8

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.